

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action dated July 6, 2009. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 and 7-21 are pending in this application.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-4, 7-10 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,344,837 to Gelsey ("Gelsey") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,953,148 to Moseley ("Moseley"). Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Gelsey in view of Moseley in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,154,855 to Norman ("Norman"). Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Gelsey in view of Moseley in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,170 to Seitz ("Seitz"). Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Gelsey in view of Moseley in view of Norman in view of Seitz.

These rejections are respectfully traversed. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-4 and 7-21 are allowable over Gelsey in view of Moseley alone and in view of any combination of Norman and Seitz for at least the following reasons.

It undisputed that "Gelsey does not explicitly teach the remaining claim limitations", namely, "wherein the contribution of light of a 3-D pixel to a certain 3-D scene point is calculated within one 3-D pixel of a row or column prior to the provision of the 3-D scene points from the one 3-D pixel to remaining 3-D pixels of the row or column, respectively such that one of the pixels of the row or column acts as a master pixel for the row or column, while other pixels of the row or column act as slave pixels" as previously provided, for example, by claim 1. (See, Final Office Action, page 3.)

The Final Office Action relies on Moseley for teaching that which is admitted missing from Gelsey, however, it is respectfully submitted that reliance on Moseley is misplaced. While Moseley does show in FIGs. 19 and 20 and Col. 3, lines 13-21, cited in the Final Office Action, (emphasis added) "'gate lines' in standard thin film transistor LCDs), which extend essentially horizontally and connect all the pixels in each row, and column conductors (referred to as "source lines") which extend essentially vertically and interconnect the pixels in each column", it is respectfully submitted that this is insufficient to teach, disclose or suggest

the recitations of the claims. In fact, Moseley merely shows a standard interconnection scheme for interconnection of rows and columns of pixels that is utilized by "standard thin film transistor LCDs" (see above cited from Moseley) to minimize interconnections to the pixels.

It is respectfully submitted that the method of claim 1 is not anticipated or made obvious by the teachings of Gelsey in view of Moseley. For example, Gelsey in view of Moseley does not teach, disclose or suggest, a method that amongst other patentable elements, comprises (illustrative emphasis provided) "performing at least one of emitting and transmitting the light by each of the 3-D pixels that is calculated to contribute to the scene point, wherein the contribution of light of a 3-D pixel to a certain 3-D scene point is calculated within one 3-D pixel of a row or column prior to the provision of the 3-D scene points from the one 3-D pixel that calculated the certain 3-D scene point to remaining 3-D pixels of the row or column that receive the calculated certain 3-D scene point, respectively such that one of the pixels of the row or column acts as a master pixel for the row or column, the master pixel being the 3-D pixel of a row or column that calculated the

certain 3-D scene point while other pixels of the row or column act as slave pixels, the slave pixels being the 3-D pixels of a row or column that receive the calculated certain 3-D scene point from the master pixel" as recited in claim 1, and as substantially recited in claim 11. Gelsey is admitted to be lacking that which is recited in the claims and Moseley, which is relied on for showing this feature, merely shows an interconnection of pixels but does not teach, disclose or suggest the master/slave relationship, nor the calculated of 3-D scene points by the master pixel recited in the claims.

It further is respectfully submitted that the method of claim 19 is not anticipated or made obvious by the teachings of Gelsey in view of Moseley. For example, Gelsey in view of Moseley does not teach, disclose or suggest, a method that amongst other patentable elements, comprises (illustrative emphasis provided) "wherein a 3-D pixel alters received co-ordinates of a 3-D scene point prior to putting out the altered 3-D scene point from the 3-D pixel that altered the 3-D scene point to at least one neighboring 3-D pixel that receives the altered 3-D scene point" and wherein for each 3-D pixel that receives an altered 3-D scene point, the act of

calculating at the 3-D pixel comprises an act of calculating the contribution of light from the 3-D pixel based on the altered 3-D scene point" as recited in claim 19. While the Office Action alleges that Moseley shows this claim recitation, it is respectfully submitted that all Moseley shows is that conductors extend between the columns and rows of pixels.

Norman and Seitz are cited for allegedly showing elements of dependent claims and as such, do not cure the deficiencies in each of Gelsey and Moseley.

Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 11 and 19 are patentable over Gelsey in view of Moseley alone and in view of any combination of Norman and Seitz and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Claims 2-10, 12-17 and 20-21 respectively depend from one of claims 1, 11 and 19 and accordingly are allowable for at least this reason as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of said claims. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the

foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

Applicants have made a diligent and sincere effort to place this application in condition for immediate allowance and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Gregory L. Thorne, Reg. 39,398
Attorney for Applicant(s)
November 9, 2009

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101

Please direct all inquiries and correspondence to:

Michael E. Belk, Reg. 33,357
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
(914) 333-9643